

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend Figure 1 by replacing Figure 1 with the Replacement Sheet Figure for Figure 1. It is believed that the Replacement Figure is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(5). Approval and entry are respectfully requested, as is withdrawal of the objections as to the drawings.

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation of claim 27 herein, claims 14 to 17 and 19 to 26 and 28 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Drawings

Regarding the objections to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), the Office Action asserts that the “metering chamber” of claim 14 and the “in an axial extent at least one reduced-wall thickness region” of claim 26, are not shown in the drawings. Figure 1 is amended herein, without prejudice, by the Replacement Sheet Figure 1, which includes metering chamber 21. No new matter has been added. Regarding claim 26, drawings are only required “where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented.” Illustration of a metering chamber or of a reduced-wall thickness region is not necessary for an understanding of claim 26. The language of the claim, in addition to the support in the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 4 to 5, provide adequate description necessary for the understanding of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant traverses this objection to the drawings.

Withdrawal of the present objections is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 27 has been cancelled herein, without prejudice, rendering moot this rejection.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 14 to 17, 19 to 234, 26 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 14 to 17, 19 to 24, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,947,091 (“Krohn”). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Kron does not anticipate the presently pending claims.

Claim 14, as presented, relates to a dosing device for a liquid fuel, the dosing device comprising, in relevant part, at least one heating element with which heat can be delivered to the fuel, including at least one of a wire braid networked in mesh fashion, and a

tubular hollow element, wherein the heating element delivers heat at least to a part of at least one of a metering conduit, an adapter, a metering device, and a nozzle body, and wherein the fuel is heated into an entirely vapor phase. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 8, lines 1 to 8, and therefore adds no new matter.

To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Final Office Action does not refer to any portion of Krohn that discloses a heating element that delivers heat at least to a part of at least one of a metering conduit, an adapter, a metering device, and a nozzle body. The Office Action refers to the heating elements 23, 23’, 23’’ and 43 of Krohn as disclosing the heating element of claim 14. The Office Action further refers to the receptacle sleeve 22 of Krohn as disclosing a metering conduit, the jacket sleeve 50 of Krohn as disclosing an adapter, the injection valve 10 of Krohn as disclosing a metering device, and the valve seat 33, the holding sleeve 34 and the seal ring 35 of Krohn as disclosing a nozzle body. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with this reading of Krohn, Krohn does not disclose, or even suggest, that any of the heating elements deliver heat to any of the reference characters 22, 50, 10, 33, 34 and 35 of Krohn. The heating elements of Krohn, as shown in Figures 1 to 3, are not located in any position to deliver heat to these features. Nor does the specification disclose, or suggest, such heat delivery.

In the response to arguments, the Final Office Action refers to Krohn at column 5, lines 35 to 38, for the disclosure that liquid fuel that strikes the inside surface of receptacle sleeve 22 will evaporate if the receptacle sleeve is hot enough. This statement does not disclose any application of heat from the heating elements to the receptacle sleeve 22. Krohn, therefore, does not disclose each and every element of claim 14 as set forth in the claim, nor does Krohn show the identical subject matter in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

While Applicant does not agree with the rejection, to facilitate matters claim 14 has been amended herein, without prejudice, to recite the fuel heated into an entirely vapor phase. As set forth in the Specification, for example, at page 8, lines 1 to 8, the fuel is heated

until completely evaporated, and is thus in the vapor phase upon entry into the metering chamber. In contrast, Krohn discloses a mix of liquid and gas fuel. For example, at column 5, lines 39 to 57, Krohn repeatedly describes the discharge of a hot mixture of liquid and vaporized fuel. Krohn does not disclose, or even suggest, fuel heated into an entirely vapor phase, and therefore does not disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of claim 14.

Accordingly, Krohn does not anticipate claim 14, or its dependent claims 15 to 17, 19 to 24, 26 and 28, which incorporate all of the features of claim 14.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Krohn. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Krohn does not render unpatentable the presently pending claim.

Claim 25 depends from claim 14 and therefore incorporates all of the features of claim 14. For at least the reasons more fully set forth above with respect to claim 14, Krohn does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 14. As such, Krohn does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 25, and therefore does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been address, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: December 10, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich, Reg. No. 42,194
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646